



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,343	05/20/2002	Takao Yoshimine	450101-03178	8796
20999	7590	08/19/2005	EXAMINER	
FROMMERM LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			CHEA, PHILIP J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/019,343	YOSHIMINE, TAKAO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Philip J. Chea	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 8-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 8-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed June 2, 2005. Claims 1-7 have been cancelled. Claims 8-14 are currently pending. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. A program-storing medium cannot be considered tangible if the medium is contained on communication medium such as cable or radio communications (e.g. a carrier wave, or transmission signal) mentioned in the specification. Therefore, the claim is lacking statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2153

2. Claims 1,13,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barracough et al. (US 6301607), herein referred to as Barracough.

As per claims 1,13,14, Barracough discloses a data-providing apparatus attached to a plurality of user apparatuses over a network, said data-providing apparatus comprising:

a receiving unit configured to receive data transmitted from one or more of said user apparatus (see column 2, lines 39-49, where web server inherently contains a receiving unit to accept the data);

a user contents control unit configured to control recording of the data received by the receiving unit into a recording area corresponding to each user apparatus (see column 2, lines 46-49, where parsing and posting implies a recording media to web page);

a shared contents control unit configured to control the recorded contents set to be shared by a user who transmits contents (see column 2, lines 50-61, where a shared contents control unit is implied if not inherent with the selection of individuals to share data); and

a data-supplying unit configured to supply data set to be shared to the user apparatus in response to a demand made by the user apparatus (see column 2, lines 56-61).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barracough as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Bubie et al. (US 6453078), herein referred to as Bubie.

Although the system disclosed by Barracough shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose thumbnail-generating means for generating a thumbnail

Art Unit: 2153

corresponding to the data received by the receiving unit, and thumbnail-transmitting means for transmitting the thumbnail to a second data-processing apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Barraclough, as evidenced by Bubie.

In an analogous art, Bubie discloses a system for generating thumbnails from an internet-based picture service (see column 4, lines 25-33), further showing thumbnail-transmitting means for transmitting the thumbnail to a second data-processing apparatus (see column 4, lines 35-40).

Given the teaching of Bubie, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Barraclough by generating and transmitting thumbnails, such as disclosed by Bubie, in order to preview multiple pictures in a manageable viewing area.

5. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barraclough as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Neel et al. (US 5,838,314).

As per claim 10, although the system disclosed by Barraclough shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the shared determining whether the data should be paid for its use, when the data is supplied to a second data-processing apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Barraclough, as evidenced by Neel et al.

In an analogous art, Neel et al. disclose a video service system that provides video signals for programming via satellite link or broadband transmission links further disclosing determining whether data should be paid for its use, when the data is supplied to a second data-processing apparatus (see column 6, lines 7-25, where watching an advertisement instead of paying for the video programming is like getting a credit from the data-processing apparatus for watching the advertisement).

Given the teaching of Neel et al., a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Barraclough by determining whether data should

Art Unit: 2153

be paid for its use, such as disclosed by Neel et al., in order to give a user an alternative to paying for movies.

As per claim 11, Barraclough in view of Neel et al. further disclose the shared contents control unit further determines a fee for the data when the data is supplied to a second data-processing apparatus (see Neel et al. column 6, lines 7-25).

As per claim 12, Barraclough in view of Neel et al. further disclose that the fee is an amount that the data-processing apparatus needs to pay to the second data-processing apparatus when the data is supplied to the second data-processing apparatus (see Neel et al. column 6, lines 7-25).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30 (1st Friday Off).

Art Unit: 2153

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Philip J Chea
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

PJC 8/9/05



KRISNA LIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Krisna Lim". Below the signature, the name "KRISNA LIM" is printed in capital letters, followed by "PRIMARY EXAMINER" on a new line.